The Divine Legation of Moſes demonſtrated from his having made expreſs Mention of, and inſiſted ſo much on the Doctrine of a future State: Whereby Mr. Warburton's Attempt to demonſtrate the Divine Legation of Moſes from his Omiſſion of a future State is proved to be abſurd, and deſtructive of all Revelation.

A

SERMON

Preached before the

University of Oxford

AT

St. MARY's, *March* 4. 1739.

By WILLIAM ROMAINE, A. M.
of *Chriſt Church.*

The Foundations of all Religion lye in two Things; that there is a God who rules the World, and that the Souls of Men are capable of ſubſiſting after Death: *For he that comes unto God, muſt believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that ſeek him*: ſo that if theſe Things be not ſuppoſed as moſt agreeable to human Reaſon, we cannot imagine upon what Grounds Mankind ſhould embrace any Way of Religion at all.

Stillingfleet's *Orig. Sacra. B.* 3. *Ch.* 1. *Sect.* 1.

LONDON:

Printed for *T. Cooper*, at the *Globe* in *Pater-noſter-Row*. MDCCXXXIX.

BRITISH MUSEUM

MARK xii. 24, 25.

And Jeſus *anſwering ſaid unto them, Do ye not therefore err, becauſe ye know not the Scriptures, neither the Power of God? For when they ſhall riſe from the Dead, they neither marry nor are given in Marriage, but are as the Angels which are in Heaven. And as touching the Dead that they riſe, have ye not read in the Book of* Moſes, *how in the Buſh God ſpake unto him, ſaying, I am the God of* Abraham, *and the God of* Iſaac, *and the God of* Jacob? *He is not the God of the Dead, but the God of the Living: Ye therefore do greatly err.*

THE New Teſtament is full of Paſſages, in which it is aſſerted, that *Moſes* hath directly treated of the State in which Man was at firſt created; " of the Laws which his Creator gave him; " of his Violation of thoſe Laws; " and of his forfeiting thereby Life here, and Happineſs hereafter; " of the Method of his being reſtored, and again enabled to attain that Happineſs; " and of his having inſtituted many Types and Figures expreſſive of the Sufferings, Death, and Reſurrection of that Perſon who was to reſtore Man to Happineſs. Though theſe Truths frequently occur in the New Teſtament, yet many Perſons have been at a Loſs where to find them in *Moſes*'s Writings; and there hath not been a more

common and popular Objection againſt them, than what hath been drawn from hence, *viz.* "That "the Deity could have no other End in the Crea- "tion but to communicate Happineſs, that there- "fore whenever he reveals his Will to his Crea- "tures, this Revelation ought to contain ſome "Means to attain Happineſs: Becauſe if it doth "not in Fact promote the Happineſs of his Crea- "tures, then it muſt either be made in vain, or "to promote Miſery, both which are Ends un- "worthy of the Deity, and inconſiſtent with his "moral Perfections. But the Law by *Moſes* doth "not contain any Means to promote the Happineſs "of God's Creatures; becauſe there is no mention "made in it of that Happineſs for which Man "was created: And becauſe Man could not an- "ſwer the End of his Creation, if he was igno- "rant of that End. The Law therefore by *Moſes* "could not be a Revelation from God; for God "never acts in vain, and could never be the Au- "thor of Miſery in keeping Men ignorant of that "great Truth, which it was of the utmoſt Im- "portance to their Happineſs to be acquainted "with."

It cannot be concealed, that the Anſwers hither- to made, have given little Satisfaction to the Ob- jectors. *A late Performance indeed promiſed to clear up this Point, and to demonſtrate the divine Legation of* Moſes *from his Omiſſion of a future State, even upon the very Principles of thoſe who rejected his Au- thority.* But this Deſign can never anſwer the End, but muſt rather promote that very Cauſe which it pretends to overthrow: Becauſe it ſtrengthens and confirms the Objection, and becauſe the very Foundation upon which it is built is weak and falſe: For it is a Matter of Fact, that a future State is mentioned in *Moſes*'s Writings, and is ſo far from not being to be found there, that it makes if not the whole, yet a very great Part of thoſe Writ-

ings, it being delivered there in ſuch plain literal Terms, that he who can barely read, may read and find it there. To thoſe modern *Sadducees* who will not ſee it there, one may ſafely ſay upon Chriſt's Authority in the Text, what he ſaid upon the very ſame Occaſion, *(a) Do ye not therefore err becauſe ye know not the Scriptures*, (and therefore if they had known the Scriptures, they would not have erred, ſo that the Doctrine they deny, muſt be con-

(a) Hammond on the New Teſtament, p. 107. Bp. *Burnet* on the 39 Articles, p. 97, 98, *&c.* Critici Sacri. Tom. 6. from p. 662, to p. 668. *Whitby* on the New Teſtament, Vol. 1. p. 179, 180. *Eraſmi* Paraph. in N. Teſt. Fol. 118. *Grotii* Op. Theologica, Tom. 2. 205, *&c.* La Sainte Bible imprimée a Liege en 3 Tom. Fol. 1702. p. 48. Tom 3. T. Cartwrighti Harmonia Evang. Lugd. Bat. 1647. p. 797, *&c.* *J. Piſcator*, in N. Teſt. Vol. 3. p. 323. *F. Gaſpari* à Melo Comment. in Lucam, p. 1002, *&c.* *V. Muſculi* in Matthæum Comment. p. 461, 462, *&c.* *Veneer* on the 39 Articles, Vol. I. p. 197, *&c.* 214, *&c.* *B. Aretius* in N. Teſt. 191, 192. *S. Barradij* Comm. in Concordiam Evang. Tom. 3. p. 593, *&c.* Continuation of *Pool*'s Synopſis. *Lond.* 1688. Notes on the 22d. Ch. of *Matthew*. *J. Tirinus* in N. Teſt. 955. *Theophylacti* in 4 Evang. Comment. *Paris* 1635. p. 132. 133, 259. *J. Lightfoot*'s Horæ Hebraïcæ in Evang. Matthæi, *Cant.* 1658. 241, 242. *Wollebij* Compend. Theol. Chriſtianæ, 192. Reſurrectionem mortuorum S. S. probant Teſtimoniis, Exemplis, Typis, & Rationibus. Rationes petuntur a fœdere Dei, quod morte non rumpitur, *Matt.* xxii. 30. Le Nouveau Teſt. par *J. Clerc*, p. 90. *Je ſuis le Dieu d' Abraham, &c.* Cette Expreſſion ne marque en Francois (and in *Engliſh* the ſame) qu'être le Dieu qu' *Abraham, Iſaac,* & *Jacob* ont adoré; d'ou l'on ne pourroit rien conclurre a' l'Egard de l'autre Vie. Mais en Hebreu elle ſignifie ſouvent, favoriſer d'une maniere extraordinaire ceux dont on ſe dit le Dieu. C'eſt le ſens qu'elle a dans toutes les Promeſſes, oú Dieu dit *qu'il ſera le Dieu* des *Iſraelites*, comme *Gen.* xvii. 7, 8. Et elle eſt fondée ſur l'Uſage des Nations de ce Temps lá dont chacune avoit des Dieux particuliers, qu'elle croyoit lui être favorables; á cauſe de quoi *être le Dieu d'une Nation*, ſignifie la favoriſer d'une Maniere toute particuliere. And if he did not favour *Abraham, &c.* as he obſerves in the next Note in an extraordinary Manner here in this World, conſequently he muſt in another. *Poli* Synopſis Criticorum, Vol. 4. p. 533, 534, 535.

 tained

tained in the Scriptures) *neither the Power of God: For have ye not read in the Book of* Moſes, (in that Part of the Scriptures in particular) *how in the Buſh God ſpake unto him, ſaying, I am the God of* Abraham, *and the God of* Iſaac, *and the God of* Jacob? (their God after they had departed this Life, and therefore they exiſted in a future State, becauſe) *he is not the God of the Dead, but the God of the Living; ye therefore do greatly err.* If we may take it for granted that our Saviour hath here made a juſt Inference, then *Moſes* will be found not only to teach a future State, but a Reſurrection alſo of the Body. *And as touching the Dead,* ſays Chriſt, *that they riſe, have ye not read in the Book of* Moſes, *how in the Buſh God ſpake unto him, ſaying, I am the God of* Abraham? Now if ſaying the Lord was God of *Abraham*, was ſaying that *Abraham* was to riſe from the Dead, it follows that the *Jews*, if they underſtood their own Language when *Moſes* wrote, muſt have known that this Doctrine was taught in his Writings. And if calling the Lord the God of *Abraham* proves his Reſurrection, then calling him the God of the *Iſraelites* muſt prove theirs: So that they muſt have known, that they alſo were to ariſe from the Dead. This Concluſion cannot but be juſt, becauſe Chriſt hath made it; and they who allow it to be juſt, muſt own that there are numerous Arguments in the Pentateuch for the Doctrine of a future State.

I might here ſhew wherein the Juſtneſs of our Saviour's Inference conſiſts, but that will be more properly conſidered in another Place; however it muſt be ſufficient to a Chriſtian Audience, and if Chriſt hath ſaid that a future State is to be found in *Moſes*, I am ſatisfied every one here preſent will conclude that it actually is there.

But our Adverſaries require other Proofs: Their Ignorance hinders them from ſeeing wherein the Force of our Saviour's Argument lyes, ſo that they

are not convinced by it; but ſend us to *Moſes* himſelf, and deſire we would ſhew them ſome plain Texts in his Writings, where a future State is expreſsly mentioned.

" As it was the Doctrine of the Reformation, and is ſtill of the Church of *England* in her Articles and Homilies, that *Moſes* hath treated of a future State: " As this is a Subject that will give us an Opportunity of clearing up the Deſign of ſome Part of *Moſes*'s Writings: " As Truth, the Glory of God, the Honour of *Moſes*, and the Revelation by him are concerned in this Enquiry: " And as we muſt be forced to give up Chriſtianity, if we cannot ſhew where a future State is mentioned in the Law, becauſe it is all throughout the New Teſtament ſaid to be there: So are we forbid by theſe Reaſons to be unconcerned in this Point; they call upon us to uſe our utmoſt Diligence, and require the moſt careful Study of every Chriſtian to find out the Places where it is directly mentioned, and to give Light to thoſe where it is taken for granted and hinted at.

It would be needleſs to prove that there ſhall be a future State. This others aſſiſted by Revelation have ſufficiently done. It will abundantly anſwer our Purpoſe, and fully convince every reaſonable Man, if we can prove the Truth of theſe three Propoſitions.

1. That if the Doctrine of a future State could not be directly found in the Law of *Moſes*, yet there are many ſtrong and unanſwerable Arguments, which ſuppoſe that it is, and prove that it ought to be there.

2. That the Doctrine of a future State actually is to be found in, and doth make a very great Part of the Writings of *Moſes*, the Obligation to obſerve every Law, Rite, and Ceremony, being enforced upon the Sanctions of future Rewards and Puniſhments.

3. That

3. That therefore the divine Legation of *Moſes* may be truly and properly demonſtrated upon theſe Principles.

If theſe Propoſitions could be fairly proved, there would be no Room to impeach the moral Perfections of God, or to accuſe *Moſes* of Impoſture. The very Suppoſition upon which theſe Accuſations are grounded would appear falſe and abſurd: And it would be ſeen, that they, who could not find the Doctrine of a future State in the Writings of *Moſes*, did not underſtand thoſe Writings: That he, who pretended to give ſome Reaſons why *Moſes* did not mention a future State, could neither do *Moſes* nor Religion any Service by ſuch a falſe Repreſentation of the Caſe: And that they who believe this to be the Caſe, are either Enemies to *Moſes* or to Truth; though in the Point before us he muſt be an Enemy to both who is ſo to either of them.

There will appear Reaſon enough for theſe and many more ſuch like Obſervations when it is prov'd,

Firſt, That if the Doctrine of a future State could not be directly found in the Law of *Moſes*, yet there are many ſtrong and unanſwerable Arguments, which ſuppoſe that it is, and prove that it ought to be there.

This will appear from Arguments drawn from Reaſon or the Nature of the Thing, and from the Scriptures of the New Teſtament. And firſt from the Reaſon of the Thing, a future State ought to make Part of the Law, becauſe upon the Suppoſition that God intended Man for Happineſs, it is inconſiſtent with his Attributes to make a Revelation of his Will, and to omit ſuch a Doctrine in it. God hath all Perfections originally in himſelf; among the reſt infinite Wiſdom, becauſe that is a Perfection: As therefore he muſt know the Value of every Thing, both as omniſcient, and as he made every Thing, it follows that he can never form

form a wrong Judgment, and being alſo infinitely good, can never prefer a leſſer Good to a greater: For nothing can appear to us with greater Certainty, than that he who hath all Perfections, cannot be imperfect; or that he who is omniſcient, cannot but know that eternal Happineſs is a much greater Good than temporal; or that he who is infinitely good cannot but be concerned to promote this greater Good in Oppoſition to the leſs. So that the Suppoſition of the Revelation by *Moſes* coming from God, and yet omitting a future State, hath theſe manifeſt Abſurdities chained to it, that God muſt either not have ſeen the *Jews* greater Good, their eternal Welfare, or if he did ſee it, not have been concerned to promote it, (*a*) *i. e.* he is either not infinitely wiſe, or not infinitely good, both which are infinite Contradictions. And therefore if eternal Happineſs be a much greater Good than temporal, and if the Deity be infinitely wiſe and good, and of Courſe muſt know and prefer this greater Good in Oppoſition to the leſſer, it is almoſt a Demonſtration, that whenever God reveals his Will to his Creatures, he muſt act conſiſtently with thoſe Attributes, and that therefore the Revelation by *Moſes* ought almoſt entirely to treat of, however to contain ſomething concerning a future State. If God indeed could promote the *Jews* eternal Happineſs more effectually by keeping them ignorant of it, then this Argument would not be concluſive, but this it will ſoon appear he neither could nor did intend to do.

2. But farther God actually did ſee this greater Good and did promote it, becauſe he gave Man Freedom of Will. For what was the Intention of the Deity in creating Man? Was it not to make him a Free-Agent? To give him certain Laws? To place him in a State of Trial, where he was to

(*a*) *Stillingfleet*'s Origines Sacræ, 153. *l.* 21.

give

give Proof of the right Uſe of his Free-Agency by obſerving thoſe Laws, and after a ſufficient Time of Probation to admit him to his Favour and endleſs Happineſs? That this was the original Intention will be readily allowed by moſt Perſons. Was Man then created for ſuch Ends, and was not he to know the End of his Creation? If he did not know it, how could he anſwer it? Being ignorant of the End for which he was created, it was impoſſible he could know the true Reaſon why thoſe Laws were given him, which were deſigned to anſwer that End. So that he could not have any Reaſon to follow thoſe Laws which were the right Means to attain the End, if he knew not that there was any End, or that the Means tended not to it: Becauſe if he was ignorant of the true Intention of the Laws, no Motive could be drawn from hence to enforce his Obſervance of them, and becauſe it is a Contradiction to aſſert, that a reaſonable Being acts without ſome Motives, or Evidence, *i. e.* without a Reaſon; and it muſt ceaſe to be reaſonable, when it acts where it hath no End in View, or where it propoſes nothing by acting: For there can be nothing to determine a reaſonable Being to perform any Action, which he cannot diſcover hath any Conſequences, or what he cannot propoſe any End in doing, *i. e.* what he hath no Reaſon to determine him to do. Man then being a Free Agent could not be treated as ſuch, unleſs he knew the End, that he might judge whether it was worthy of his Choice, and would be a ſufficient Over-Balance to the Diſadvantages which attended the Practice of the Means. (*a*) As he was to chooſe for himſelf, the Caſe ought to have been fairly and fully ſtated to him: But what Room was there to chooſe, if he was ſuffered to know only one Side of the Caſe, and yet it was expected of him,

(*a*) *Locke*'s Hum. Underſ. Vol. I. p. 216. Sect. 51, 52.

that

that he ſhould determine upon both, and in Favour of that Side for which no Evidence appeared; than which nothing can be more abſurd and impoſſible. Theſe Things then being neither known nor offered to Man's Choice, Man was made a Free Agent, and yet had no Opportunity of giving any Proofs of the right Uſe of his Free Agency, in that Point for which only he was made a Free Agent. To affirm therefore, that there is no mention of a future State in the Revelation by *Moſes*, is upon theſe Accounts abſurd, *viz.* That it ſuppoſes God created Man a Free Agent for certain Ends, and yet that he was not concerned to promote thoſe Ends, or to let Man know that there was any End at all; and that he who made Man did not know that he made him a Free Agent, or after he had made him, did not think fit to treat him as ſuch; created him a Being endued with a Soul, an immaterial Principle, equal to the Angels; and yet uſed him as if he had given him only a Body, equal to the Brutes; thus preferring the leſſer Good to the greater, which the Deity cannot do. And therefore it is a neceſſary Conſequence, that if God made Man a Free Agent for certain Ends, and yet did not reveal thoſe Ends in the Revelation by *Moſes*, he could not have treated the *Jews* as Free Agents, which he certainly did intend to do by making them ſuch, or have promoted the *greater eternal*, in Oppoſition to temporal Happineſs, which he always muſt and will do.

But in another View. Man was made a Free Agent, and had certain Laws given him, but why was he to be puniſhed eternally for breaking thoſe Laws? The Juſtice of this Proceeding was founded no Doubt upon his knowing the Conſequences of breaking them: For it cannot be conſiſtent with the Juſtice of God to puniſh Men for thoſe Crimes which they did not know deſerved to be puniſhed, *i. e.* did not know to be Crimes. If Men found

it right to do certain Actions, ſaw plainly that they would promote their temporal Happineſs, and had no other to promote, what can there be criminal in ſuch Actions? (*a*) Where Virtue often expoſes Men to Dangers and Hardſhips in this Life, and Vice often ſeduces by Promiſes of temporal Welfare, in ſuch Caſes it muſt be fit and right that they, who have no Notion of a future State, ſhould be obliged to conſult their Happineſs in this. Strict Juſtice certainly cannot cenſure ſuch a Conduct, or puniſh Men for doing what according to the beſt Light God hath given them ſeems to be their Duty to do.

(*b*) And how is it that human Lawgivers proceed? Do they not promulgate the Laws and their Sanctions together? Knowing that is not a Law but a Matter of Prudence, which they recommend to the Practice of others without any Sanctions. And was it not always reckoned the higheſt Injuſtice to make Puniſhments bear no Proportion to Crimes, to require Obedience in certain Points, to conceal the Intention of requiring this Obedience, thereby to puniſh the Offenders not according to any prior Law, but the preſent abſolute Will of the Judge. This Proceeding can only anſwer the Ends of the moſt arbitrary Government. A juſt Lawgiver publiſhes his Laws, ſhews Men the Reaſonableneſs of obſerving, and the Penalties they incur by breaking them: Thus he ſets before them Life and Death, ſo that when they tranſgreſs, they know the Conſequences, and when they ſuffer, can blame none but their own ſinful ſelves. Had not the Penalties been known, the Action had been

(*a*) Niſi enim crediderit quiſpiam Compenſationem eſſe bonorum & malorum, non beneplacebit Deo. Quomodo enim laborioſum virtutis iter ingrediatur, non perſuaſus in futuro ſeculo multiplices ac ſtabiles eſſe Retributiones? *Theophylact.* in Epiſtolas, p. 990.

(*b*) *Locke*'s Hum. Underſ. Book 2d. Ch. 28. p. 325. Sect. 6. in-

indifferent and it would have been extreme Injuſtice to have puniſh'd, *i. e.* to have made that criminal afterwards, which was indifferent when it was done. But when the Laws are fit and right in themſelves, when the Sanctions are known, and Free Agents have it in their Power to chooſe, if in ſuch Circumſtances they tranſgreſs, then and then only Puniſhments are accounted reaſonable and neceſſary.

And ſhall Mankind act with ſo much Wiſdom, Juſtice and *Goodneſs?* And ſhall not the Judge of all the Earth do Right? Shall he alone promulgate his Laws, and not ſhew his Servants the Reaſonableneſs of obſerving them, or the Conſequences of breaking them? Blind Obedience, as it is not a Matter of Choice, can never be required by, or recommend us to the Searcher of Hearts. This is our Merit in his Eyes, if we have any Merit in ourſelves, to know our Duty and the Conſequences of it, to be tempted by preſent Advantages to neglect it, to prefer future Expectations to thoſe Advantages, and ſo to reſiſt the Temptation. *(a)* God himſelf in Scripture hath every where approved of this Motive, hath mentioned the Hopes of another Life as the ſtrongeſt Motive to Obedience, and therefore it cannot be conſiſtent with the divine Juſtice to require univerſal Obedience, and yet to refuſe Men the ſtrongeſt Motive to it; or conſiſtent with infinite Goodneſs, not to communicate what infinite Wiſdom hath approved. If God does not afford this Motive, how can he puniſh Men for not attending to it? They are to be treated hereafter according to the Choice they have made here; but if they could not think that a bad Choice

(*a*) *Matt.* v. 12. vi. 33. *Col.* iii. 1, 2. 1 *Cor.* ix. 24, 25. 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18. *Heb.* xii. 2. *Stilling fleet's* Orig. Sac. *p.* 615, 616. § 8. par. 5. Bp. *Wilkins's* Sermons 8^vo^ Serm. 1ſt. on *Heb.* xi. 26. where he proves that it is *neceſſary* for the moſt eminent Saints to ſtrengthen and ſupport themſelves in their Difficulties by a ſpecial and particular Regard to the Recompence of Reward.

which they could not diſcover had any bad Conſequences, why were they to be puniſhed for not having more Knowledge than their Creator was pleaſed to afford them Means of attaining? Is it not Cruelty that he, who did not treat Men as Free Agents here, ſhould yet treat them as ſuch hereafter? And what Proceeding can be more unmerciful, more barbarous than to condemn thoſe to eternal Miſery, who could not know that their Actions would lead them to it, and who might have been influenced to a contrary Practice, by being informed that they might thereby have avoided that Miſery and obtained Happineſs? For if Happineſs and Miſery were not offered to their Choice, how could it be known which they would chooſe? Or if they did chooſe the Means that led to Miſery, what more extreme Injuſtice than to puniſh them for a Choice occaſioned by involuntary Ignorance? If God then made Man a Free Agent, put it in his Power to make a wrong Choice, and did not let him know the Conſequences of it, was not this as it were enſnaring him into Miſery, and intending him for Deſtruction? (*a*) But this is the Buſineſs of that Being who is the very reverſe of the Deity. And therefore if the *Jews* were Free Agents, if God was concerned to treat them as ſuch, and if without he revealed to them a future State, he could not treat them as ſuch here or hereafter, we may fairly conclude from the Reaſon of the Thing, that the Law by *Moſes* ought to contain ſomething concerning a future State.

But to advance one Step farther. The Ignorance of a future State tended directly to deſtroy the Practice of the Means that lead to Happineſs, ſo that Man, being a Free Agent, could neither be treated as ſuch, nor attain the Happineſs he was intended for without the Knowledge of a future State.

(*a*) *Stillingfleet*'s Origines Sacræ, p. 610, 618. P. II. C. II.

To

To this Purpoſe revealed Reaſon will inform us, that the Deity is chiefly concerned to propagate Wiſdom and Goodneſs: For as Wiſdom is the Knowledge of what is right and fit in every Caſe, and as Goodneſs is the Practice of ſuch Wiſdom, theſe muſt be the chief Objects of the divine Care, the great Points about which Man's Free-Will was to be employed, and muſt comprehend the Means to all human Happineſs. And the ſame Reaſon will alſo tell us, that if the Law contained nothing about a future State, it could make the *Jews* neither wiſer nor better, and therefore could not treat them as Free Agents; ſo that the End the Deity propoſed by making Man a Free Agent was defeated by himſelf, and the Law a divine Revelation by the very Nature of it promoted Miſery. But wiſer this great Silence about a future State could not make the *Jews:* Becauſe it fixed all their Views on this Life, it made only the good Things of this World the Centre of their Joys, and therefore ſhut out every Thought of that Happineſs for the Enjoyment of which Man was created. And this muſt have led them to the groſſeſt Ignorance of their Duty. God every where in S. S. claims the Heart and the Affections of Man. He cannot ſuffer any Rival in our Eſteem. He expects that all our Faculties ſhould be at all Times conſecrated to his Service: For as he alone deſerves our Praiſe and Worſhip, he therefore expects they ſhould be paid to him alone: Hence the neceſſary Duty of ſetting our Hearts entirely on Things above, of directing all our Actions to an heavenly Country, and diſengaging our Affections from the World. But how can Man give God his whole Heart and Affections and withdraw himſelf from the Things of this Life, attentive to thoſe of another, and how can God in Juſtice expect thoſe Duties, if he doth not reveal to Man that he doth expect them? For is it not impoſſible that Men ſhould be

more converſant with thoſe Subjects which they have no Notion of, than with thoſe of which they are Maſters? Was it ever expected that Men ſhould be Profeſſors of any Science before they were inſtructed in it, or could be perfect before they had begun to learn? Is not this to require Men to ſee without Eyes, and to hear without Ears? The *Jews* therefore could not poſſibly have been made wiſer by being ignorant of a future State, but muſt have entertained theſe abſurd Notions of the Law, have taken the Means to be the End, or that there were Means which led to no End; or that Man was made for ſome other End than he really was; or made for no noble End at all, made only for this World to get Proviſions, to propagate, to die, to rot.

If then we may be allowed to ſuppoſe, that God could not make the *Jews* wiſer by keeping them in Ignorance about a future State; and indeed there is ſomething very paradoxical in imagining, that Men may be made wiſer by being kept in Ignorance of that End about which all their Wiſdom was to be employed, We may proceed to enquire whether this Ignorance could make them better. (*a*) And here one might inſiſt on the Neceſſity of adding Knowledge to Virtue, leſt Men ſhould err by following a falſe Rule of Duty, or by acting upon wrong Motives. One may ſhew, that it is of the Eſſence of every good Action that it ſhould be free and Matter of Choice, and that it cannot be ſo in the preſent Caſe. (*b*) And farther, that the *Jews* muſt have wanted the moſt powerful Motive to the Practice of Virtue, that which takes ſtrongeſt Hold of the Conſcience, hath the greateſt Command over our Hopes and Fears, influences our Thoughts as well as Actions, and which alone can be an adequate Foun-

(*a*) *Stillingfleet*'s Origines Sacræ, B. 3d. Ch. 1. p. 361, 362.
(*b*) *Locke*'s Hum. Underſ. Vol. 1ſt. Ch. 21. p. 221. Sect. 60, and p. 228. Sect. 70. *Stillingfleet*'s Orig. Sac. 471, 472.

dation

ation of universal Obedience. But it will be sufficient to observe that Virtue, or to act conformably to the known Laws of God, supposes that Free Agents either know why they act so, or not. If the *Jews* had Reasons which induced them to act virtuously, then it must be either the Love of the Law itself: But this it could not be, because they thought it was a real Pain, Yoke, Bondage, Slavery, and called it by almost every Name that denotes an Unwillingness of Mind, and an Uneasiness of Body to observe it: Or the Love of its Consequences, that future Reward which they might hope for; but this they are supposed to be ignorant of, therefore they had no Reason to be virtuous, and consequently as they were Free Agents, they could not be virtuous at all (*a*).

But it hath been said, that we are to practise Virtue because God commands us! We may perhaps in our Circumstances: But if God's Laws had made us miserable here, and we had no Expectations from him hereafter, what was to determine us to observe his Laws? We are told that Gratitude would, and that this calls upon us to make all possible Returns of Thankfulness to our Benefactors. But if Gratitude be a just Sense and Acknowledgment of Favours received, it cannot be expressed to any Being who makes us miserable. If our Pleasures lye within a small Compass, if there be ever something that embitters them and dulls their Relish, if Indulgence in them creates real Pain, and if even a great Part of those we are capable of receiving are forbidden, what Room is there for Thanks and Praises? If our Pains exceed our Pleasures, it is absurd to be grateful; because to be pleased with Pain is a Contradiction in Terms: And therefore setting aside all Hopes of an Hereafter, there could be no Room for Gratitude, when we were made miserable by

(*a*) *Law*'s preliminary Dissertation to *King*'s Orig. of Evil, *p.* 2, 66.

being

being brought into Being. But if God ſhould give us all the good Things of this Life, and make us really happy in this World, would not this be a ſufficient Motive to Obedience even without the Knowledge of a future State? Neither could this of itſelf poſſibly anſwer the End propoſed, becauſe if Men were abſolutely free from Wants, there could be no Temptation, conſequently no State of Trial, and therefore no Room for voluntary Obedience.

This great Silence about a future State then could not make the Obſervers of the Law either Wiſer or Better. Every one will draw the Inference, what therefore it did make them. And ſhall we ſuffer Men to ſay that the Law had ſuch a Deſign? That a Revelation from God propoſed ſuch an unworthy End? That the moral Perfections of the Deity could authorize ſuch immoral Proceedings? Let us remove ſuch unjuſt Aſperſions from the Supreme Being, and ſuppoſe at preſent that if we could not find out and prove that a future State does make Part of the Law, that however the Perfections of the Deity, the End of Man's Creation, and the Neceſſity of anſwering that End require that it ought to be there, and that our not ſeeing it immediately might perhaps be owing to our own Ignorance, to our little Inſight into the Cuſtoms, Manners, and Ceremonies of the *Jews*, the Genius of their Language, and the received Opinions of the Time when *Moſes* writ: To theſe and many other Reaſons a good Man would be inclined to attribute his not diſcovering it immediately, before he would impeach the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God, and make him an imperfect Being rather than own himſelf to be ſuch an one.

But farther the Revelation by *Moſes* could not come from God without the Doctrine of a future State was contained in it: For though it be true in Fact, that God did ſee and prefer Man's eternal Hap-

Authorities both of ſacred and profane Hiſtory) worſhipped the Heavens, to which they attributed very great and extraordinary Powers. It is very obvious to every one who is but ſuperficially read in the Eaſtern Hiſtories, or the Scriptures, that the Hoſt of Heaven, the Queen of Heaven, the Sun, the Light, the Moon, and Stars are every where repreſented to be the Objects of their Worſhip. In Conſequence of this we find they aſſerted, that the Heavens were the Givers of all temporal Happineſs, the Cauſes of Motion, of Light, of Heat, of the Earth's Motions, of the Seaſons, of Vegetation, the Flux and Reflux of the Sea, the Supporters of the animal Oeconomy, and of every Operation in Matter. But they did not ſtop here, they ſuppoſed them alſo to be independent, thought that they, whom they ſaw the chief Rulers in this Syſtem, had this Power originally in themſelves. They who ſet up falſe Gods, ſet up at the ſame Time falſe Redeemers, and therefore can have no Benefit from the true. If then God was at all Times concerned to prevent this falſe Worſhip from becoming univerſal, leſt the grand Scheme of Redemption ſhould be defeated, (for univerſal Corruption muſt have brought on an univerſal Deſtruction) then he muſt have been particularly concerned to keep the *Jews* from this Crime, not only becauſe they were the ſole People upon the Earth to whom he at that Time choſe to reveal his Will; but alſo becauſe it was determined that the Meſſiah ſhould deſcend from a Branch of this Nation. And what was the moſt likely Method to keep the *Jews* from this Idolatry? If God had indeed given to the Objects that were worſhipped a delegated Power, he could not take it from them without deſtroying this Syſtem. But if he could prove himſelf ſuperior to thoſe his Rivals, and demonſtrate that they were abſolutely dependent on him; if he could ſupport his Followers without their Aſſiſtance,

and deſtroy thoſe who expected Protection from them, this Method would certainly preſerve them from the falſe Worſhip, and attach them to the true God: And there would be no Fear of Succeſs, if God would grant the *Jews* all the temporal Bleſſings which his Rivals were ſuppoſed to give, and defend them in the Poſſeſſion of thoſe Bleſſings, which though the falſe Worſhippers expected, yet could they not receive from their Gods. And this indulgent Method the Deity was pleaſed to take. Did his Rivals pour down all temporal Bleſſings on their Worſhippers? So did he on his. Were they the known Cauſes that a Land flow'd with Milk and Honey? The God of *Iſrael* was infinitely liberal to the *Jews* of thoſe Favours. Were they the Givers of Wine and Oil, and Bread? Jehovah was to give theſe even by a Miracle rather than the *Jews* ſhould want. Were they imagined to be able to avert Diſtempers from their Followers? Every obedient *Jew* had an Aſſurance that he ſhould never experience Sickneſs or Pain. Did they make their Followers proſperous, give them fruitful Seaſons, great Increaſe of Flocks and Herds, Rain to refreſh and enrich the thirſty Ground and whatever filleth the Heart of Man with Joy and Gladneſs? The Worſhippers of the true God of Heaven were indulged even to Luxury in thoſe Bleſſings. Were they the Givers of long Life, of a numerous Iſſue, of Victory over Enemies, of Succeſs in every Undertaking, or whatever Advantages the falſe Worſhippers expected? Thoſe Jehovah was pleaſed to engage his Omnipotence to ſecure to the *Jews*. And to prove his Superiority in every Reſpect, he by many unqueſtionable Miracles (ſuited to this End) delivered his Servants from the Slavery of one Land, and put them in Poſſeſſion of another, where his Rivals being worſhipped and overcome, made it almoſt impoſſible for any thinking *Jew* to doubt whether they had any Power in themſelves

Happineſs to temporal, though he made him a Free Agent, that he alſo might ſee and prefer it, and actually taught him the Means to prefer and thereby attain it; yet Man preferred an imaginary to a real Good, made a wrong Uſe of his Free-Agency, neglected the Means that lead to Happineſs, and choſe the Means to Miſery. As a Conſequence of this God could not reveal his Will to him whilſt he was in this State, becauſe as a Sinner he was an Object of the Divine Vengeance, of that Juſtice which he had provoked, and of that Puniſhment which he had deſerved (*a*). If God had only left Man in this State to himſelf, he would have been ſufficiently tormented with his own Terrors and Deſpair. But that God did afterwards converſe with him is a Demonſtration that his Juſtice was appeaſed, that ſomething had interpoſed to ſatisfy and avert the Divine Vengeance, and to reſtore Man to Favour and Happineſs. And that therefore the Law by *Moſes*, being given to thoſe who had ſinned and forfeited Happineſs, ought to contain the Conditions upon which they might again attain it, and conſequently not only the Knowledge of a future State, but alſo the Means of attaining an happy one (*b*). For if *Moſes* hath ſaid, that Man ſinned, offended Juſtice, could not of himſelf ſatisfy it, and that nevertheleſs God revealed his Will to this ſinful Creature, is it not certain that Juſtice was ſatisfied, and Man again reſtored to Favour? Otherwiſe what could have induced the *Jews* to the Obſervance of the Law, if it had not taught them ſome Means of making this Satisfaction, of reconciling them to God, and reſtoring them to Happineſs and Heaven? For if they knew that God was offended with them, they

(*a*) Thirty-nine Articles, Art. 9. on Original Sin: And Art. 10. on Free-will. Art. 13.

(*b*) *Stilling fleet*'s Origines Sacræ. p. 600, 601, 602.

muſt firſt be aſſured the Service they paid would render them acceptable to him, before they could pay it: Unleſs we can ſuppoſe them ſo ſtupid as to worſhip God without any Reaſon, or ſerved him to offend and provoke him more. If then we can prove that the Law came from God, and that the *Jews* ever obſerved it as ſuch, it muſt certainly follow that it ought to be full of the Doctrine of a future State.

There is an Objection which too much affects what hath been already obſerved, and is too common not to be taken Notice of, that many and repeated Promiſes every where occur in the Law, which relate only to the good Things of this Life; and this hath ſtaggered even thoſe Perſons who have been influenced, by Arguments drawn from the Nature of the Thing, to own that a future State ought to have made Part of the Law. It is indeed true in Fact, that many of the Rewards and Puniſhments in the Law are temporal; but then let it be remembered that the very Ground and Reaſon of inſiſting ſo much upon theſe was, that it was known there were alſo eternal. For I would obſerve that at the Time when *Moſes* wrote, the greateſt Part of Mankind had corrupted themſelves, had withdrawn their Allegiance from the true God, and ſet up the Work of his Hands in Oppoſition to him. Moſt of thoſe ancient Idolaters (as it might eaſily be proved from numerous (*a*)

(*a*) *J. Boulduc*, de Eccleſiâ ante Legem. 281, 282, *&c.* The Chevalier *Ramſay*'s Diſcourſe on the Theology and Mytho. of the *Pagans*, p. 2. Parag. 2. *T. Goodwin*'s Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Rites of the *Hebrews*, p. 142, 143, 144, 145, 160, 161, 162, 163. An Eſſay to a natural Hiſtory of the Bible, by *John Hutchinſon*. *Acts* vii. 42, 43. *Diogenes Laert.* de Vitis Phil. Ed. *H. Stephens*, 1593. p. 7. *Stillingfleet*'s Origines Sacræ, 42, 43, 44. l. 21. The Worſhip of the Sun as far as we can learn was the great and moſt early Idolatry of the Eaſtern Countries, *&c.* p. 219, 220. *J. Boſſuet*, Diſcourſ. ſur l'Hiſtoire univerſelle, p. 195.

Au-

good Things of this Life, to engage their Affections to him, and the good Things of another; and that if he had not been pleaſed to proceed in this merciful Manner, neither they nor we (if the Vices of Mankind can defeat the gracious Intentions of the Deity towards them) could have had any Happineſs here or hereafter.

Let it be ſufficient to have obſerved thus much from Reaſon, or the Nature of the Thing, that the Doctrine of a future State ought to have made Part of the Law by *Moſes*. We are now to enquire what Proofs there are in the New Teſtament that *Moſes* hath wrote about a future State, but before we proceed to this Enquiry, it will be proper to ſhew what Weight ſuch Proofs ought to have with us.

1. Then the Old and the New Teſtaments contain two dependent Parts of one grand Diſpenſation, *viz.* Chriſtianity. This will not be diſputed by any one, who allows that they both came from God after the Fall, and that *Chriſt was the End of the Law*, Rom. x. 4.

2. As they came from God, and propoſed the ſame End, they muſt therefore be true and infallible: For God cannot deceive or be deceived, and the ſame End cannot be attained by contrary Means.

3. Having the ſame End in View, and being both of them infallible, they muſt therefore confirm and ſtrengthen each other's Evidence: For they are both Means to attain one and the ſame End, and one Truth cannot overthrow or deſtroy another Truth.

4. And therefore if they ſhould contradict one another, this is a ſufficient Proof that they could

eſſe. Terrenæ cœleſtes includunt, *Stillingfleet*'s Orig. Sacræ. p. 221, *&c.* Sect. 2. *Calvin.* Inſtit. Chriſt. Relig. Gen. Fol. from p. 82, to 87. And all the Writers againſt the Anabaptiſts and Antinomians.

not be two dependent Parts of one grand Diſpenſation, nor come from God, and that therefore one of them, if not both are falſe and forged: Becauſe if they be falſe in any one Point, it cannot be proved that they are infallible in all, and becauſe the ſame Propoſition cannot be both true and falſe at the ſame Time.

5. If then it cannot be aſſerted in the New Teſtament, that the Doctrine of a future State is delivered in the old, without deſtroying its own Authority, if it be not in it, and if notwithſtanding this, it is directly aſſerted in the New Teſtament, that it is in the Old, and yet is not, as ſome Men think, in Fact to be found there: Is it not a plain Conſequence that they who maintain this are inconſiſtent with themſelves, if they do not deny and give up the Authority of one of the Teſtaments? There cannot be a more effectual Method taken to overthrow Revelation than this, and *I wiſh* it may not be the Cauſe that the *Author of the divine Legation*, and his Followers would ſupport: They cannot be ignorant that they are labouring to ſet one Teſtament againſt the other, thereby to overthrow the Authority of both. We grant them indeed, that if either of the Teſtaments contradict each other, they cannot both be the Word of God: But then we inſiſt that they no where contradict themſelves, and that in the preſent Caſe the Doctrine of a future State (as will hereafter appear) is as plainly delivered by *Moſes* in the Old Teſtament, as it is aſſerted to be there by Chriſt and his Apoſtles in the New.

From theſe Premiſſes it may be juſtly concluded, that it is an infallible Proof to us, who hold the divine Authority of both Teſtaments, that *Moſes* hath treated of a future State in the Law, if it be affirmed in the Goſpel that he hath treated of it there: For theſe are obvious and certain Truths, that God cannot contradict himſelf, that infinite

Wiſdom

independent of Jehovah the God (*Elohim*) of *Iſrael*. So that this Truth was fully demonſtrated that there were no other Gods to whom the Worſhip and Service of Man was due, but the Lord alone. This was one Reaſon (among many others) why the good Things of this Life are ſo often promiſed in the Law. The Deity could not have made a more glorious Diſplay of infinite Wiſdom, Mercy and Power, than by ſuch a Condeſcenſion to the Circumſtances of Mankind, unleſs by the Scheme of Redemption, to which this alſo related and was preparatory: He could not otherwiſe have demonſtrated his Superiority or brought about his gracious Deſigns. If this then be one undeniable Reaſon why God inſiſted ſo much on temporal Bleſſings, it is manifeſt that a future State muſt have been taken for (*a*) granted both by the Jews and Idolaters, otherwiſe the End of being ſo very much concerned about them is loſt, and the Scripture muſt be falſe which aſſerts that God chiefly granted them with an higher View, with reſpect to eternal Bleſſings. Many Authorities will be produced from *Moſes* to prove this Point, but let the Argument in the Text ſuffice at preſent. Thus (*Exod.* xx. 2.) *I am the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt have none other*, implies they were to worſhip the Lord alone, becauſe he was their God; then the Sanction of this Commandment which forbids Idolatry, is not preſent Happineſs but future, or as Chriſt hath inferred, the Reſurrection of the Body. So that the Bleſſings of Heaven itſelf, as well as of this World were promiſed to be the Rewards of thoſe who kept themſelves free from Idolatry. And that the Idolaters alſo expected a future State is certain, becauſe they all did ſomething for their Dead,

(*a*) See *Stillingfleet*'s Reaſons of *Moſes* inſiſting ſo little on this Doctrine, Book 3. ch. 1. p. 363, &c. Sect. 2.

(*a*) Dead, ſacrificed to make their Gods propitious to their departed Friends, anointed their Bodies with what was conſecrated to and deſcriptive of what was to entitle them to, the Favour of the Gods, and afterwards carefully laid up their Bodies in Monuments repreſentative of thoſe Powers, which they thought their Gods had to raiſe them from the Dead. Thus much we find they did even in the Time of *Moſes*. A future State then ſeems to have been known both by the Jews and Idolaters, and therefore if the general Object of the *Heathens* Worſhip were the Heavens; if God was concerned to prevent this falſe Worſhip from becoming univerſal to effect the greateſt and moſt merciful Deſign, the Redemption of Man; and if the Method he took was the beſt and wiſeſt, *viz.* to grant the *Jews* all thoſe Bleſſings which the Idolaters expected, and to ſecure the Enjoyment of them which he alone could do, what can be more plain than that a future State ought to make a great Part of the Law: Becauſe we can give a rational Account why God inſiſted ſo much on temporal Bleſſings; and becauſe it hath appeared that even theſe were founded upon a Suppoſition, that it was known there were alſo eternal; ſo that the Objection, that temporal Promiſes and Threatenings every where occur in the Law, need not now be a Stumbling-block to any of *Moſes*'s Friends. It is a ſufficient Anſwer (even if we could give no better), that the Deity was with no other View ſo much concerned about the temporal Happineſs of the *Jews*, but as it was founded upon and tended to promote their eternal; (*b*) that he was indulgent of the good

(*a*) *Deut.* xxvi. 14. *Pſal.* cvi. 28. *Deut.* xiv. 1. *T. Goodwyn*'s Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Rites of the *Hebrews*, p. 243. Paragraph 3.

(*b*) Wollebij Compend. Theol. Chriſtianæ, p. 60. Promiſſiones terrenæ cœleſtium rerum ſunt Symbola: Falsò igitur Servetani & Anabaptiſtæ ſomniant, promiſſiones illas tantum terrenas eſſe.

Wiſdom cannot be deceived, that infinite Power need not, and Goodneſs will not deceive, and that therefore there muſt be a perfect Harmony and Agreement of all the Revelations from God.

The Paſſages in the New Teſtament, in which it is aſſerted that *Moſes* hath treated of a future State, are ſo many and plain that their Meaning cannot be diſputed. The Parable of the rich Man and the Beggar is a remarkable Inſtance of this Truth. (*Luke* xvi.) *Dives*, being in Hell, entreats *Abraham* to ſend *Lazarus* to his Father's Houſe, to teſtify to his Brethren leſt they alſo ſhould come into that Place of Torments. This certainly was to let his Brethren know, that there was a future State of Rewards and Puniſhments. The Anſwer is, That *if they believe not* Moſes *and the Prophets, neither would they be perſuaded though one roſe from the Dead.* Then there is greater Evidence for this Truth in the Writings of *Moſes* and the Prophets than even a Meſſage from the other World would be *(a)*. This Inference is ſo direct, that whilſt the Words have any Meaning, it will be impoſſible to elude the Force of them, or to explain them away.

Agreeably to this Place we find St. *Paul* preached a future State and Reſurrection of the Body upon *Moſes*'s Authority, (*Acts* xxvi. 22, 23.) *I continue unto this Day witneſſing both to ſmall and great, ſay-*

(a) *Whitby* on the New Teſt. Vol. 1. p. 398. D. Stellæ in Lucam Comm. Tom. 2. p. 302. Martinus Bucerus in 4 Evang. p. 216. *Si Moſen & Prophetas non audiunt*, &c. His enim ſignificavit (Chriſtus) nos Scripturam habere de his ſatis teſtantem, ad quam mortuorum Teſtimonium nihil poſſit adjicere. *J. Lindſay* on the New Teſt. *Lond.* 1736. p. 216. Marlorati Biblioth. Expoſitionum in Nov. Teſt. 333. J. Tirinus in Nov. Teſt. p. 999. *Neque ſi quis ex mortuis reſurrexerit, credent.* Quàm facilè enim erit explodere ejuſmodi Apparitionem, & vel Phantaſiæ vel Dæmoni aſcribere? Nonne Lazarus alter, nonne Chriſtus a mortuis redivivi? An illis ideò crediderunt Judæi? Unde meritò omni mortuorum Apparitioni præfertur S. Scriptura, tanquam certior Teſtis Tormentorum Inferni.

ing none other Things than thoſe which the Prophets and Moſes *did ſay ſhould come: That Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and that he ſhould be the firſt* (which neceſſarily implies that others after him were alſo to) *ariſe from the Dead.* Doth *Moſes* then ſay that Chriſt was to ſuffer and to ariſe from the Dead? And doth St. *Paul* affirm that he doth ſay ſo? And can any Chriſtian after this, doubt whether ſuch Doctrines are really taught by *Moſes?* It is almoſt a Demonſtration, that if St. *Paul* was inſpired, of courſe infallible, and therefore could not poſſibly be ignorant of what was contained in *Moſes*'s Writings, and that if he hath ſaid a future State was mentioned there, that therefore it muſt be there.

But let us hear Chriſt himſelf preaching the ſame Doctrines from *Moſes* that St. *Paul* did. All his Diſciples after his Death doubted of his Reſurrection, and yet before they could preach this fundamental Article to others, they were to be convinced of it themſelves. To this End in his Converſation with two of them, who were going to *Emmaus*, he reproves their Slowneſs in believing, that he ought to have ſuffered, died, and roſe from the Dead, as *Moſes* and the Prophets had foretold. The Words are theſe, (*Luke* xxiv. 25, *&c.*) *Then he ſaid unto them, O Fools, and ſlow of Heart to believe all that the Prophets have ſpoken! Ought not Chriſt to have ſuffered theſe Things, and to enter into his Glory? And beginning at* Moſes *and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the Things concerning himſelf*, viz. what *Moſes* and the Prophets had wrote about his Sufferings and Reſurrection (*a*). In the following Part of the Chapter this Truth is more fully expreſſed, *Theſe* (ſays Chriſt to his Diſciples) *are the Words which I*

(*a*) Grotij. Op. Theol. Vol. 2. p. 465. F. Gaſpari à Melo Comm. in Lucam. p. 1145, 1146, *&c.* D. Stellæ in Lucam Comment. Lugd. 1592. Tom. 2. 516, 517. *Acts* xvii. 2, 3.

ſpake

ſpake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all Things muſt be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moſes, *and in the Prophets, and in the Pſalms concerning me. Then opened he their Underſtanding that they might underſtand the Scriptures, and ſaid unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behoved Chriſt to ſuffer, and to riſe from the Dead the third Day.* Doth Chriſt then affirm, that it was written in the Law of *Moſes*, that he was to ſuffer, and to ariſe from the Dead? And ſhall there be a Chriſtian Prieſt ſuffered in a Chriſtian Country with equal Impudence and Blaſphemy to contradict Chriſt, and to maintain that ſuch Doctrines are not written in the Law of *Moſes*? Hath Chriſt ſaid that thoſe Perſons *do greatly err, and do not know the Scriptures*, who affirm that *Moſes* hath not mentioned a future State, and is it poſſible that Man can believe Chriſt to be God, who poſitively declares, that he *neither doth err, nor is ignorant of the Scriptures*, whilſt he directly writes againſt the true literal Meaning of Chriſt's Words? And how doth it alleviate his Crime to tell us, that he intends to ſtrengthen the Evidence of Revelation by his Syſtem? Doth it not require too much Credulity and Ignorance for any Man in his Senſes to believe, that thoſe Perſons are ſupporting the Superſtructure, who are removing and taking away the Foundation? Chriſtianity hath no Support, if Chriſt ſhould fall, and either he or *Moſes* muſt fall, if he affirms, that *Moſes* hath wrote about certain Subjects, and it could not be made appear that he hath once mentioned them.

But there is a Paſſage in St. *John*, (v. 39, *&c.*) where, if Words have any Meaning, it is aſſerted, not only that *Moſes* wrote about a future State, but that the *Jews* alſo knew he had. *Search the Scriptures*, (ſays Chriſt) *for in them ye think ye have eternal Life, and they are they which teſtify of me.* All the Scriptures teſtify of Chriſt, and *Moſes* in a particu-

lar Manner; for as he adds, *had ye believed* Moſes, *ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me (a).* So the *Jews* had, or however thought they had eternal Life in *Moſes*'s Writings (*b*). *Moſes* then did write about eternal Life, if Chriſt knew what he wrote about, and if the *Jews* all along believed that he had. And this Senſe, and this only the Argument will bear (*c*). There is Evidence, ſays Chriſt, in *Moſes*, that the Meſſiah was to entitle you to eternal Life, you think that you have this Evidence in *Moſes*, and yet you act inconſiſtently with yourſelves by not believing in me the Meſſiah, *and Life eternal.* I will not therefore accuſe you hereafter, becauſe you did not believe my Words or Miracles. *Moſes* ſhall accuſe you, becauſe you have not made the right Uſe of that Evidence, which he gave you, and which ought to have determined you to accept me as the Meſſiah, *and thereby that Life eternal*, which you think you have, and which you cannot otherwiſe have in his Writings.

That the *Jews* had ſuch a Belief and Hope founded upon *Moſes*'s Writings, St. *Paul* will abundantly convince us: In his Vindication of himſelf

(*a*) Poli Synopſis Cr. Vol. 4. p. 1217, 1218. Critici Sacri. Vol. 6. p. 1626. Notæ Cameron. in v. 39. Hammond on the N. Teſt. p. 280. *J. Piſcator* in N. Teſt. Vol. 3. p. 323. *J. Lindſay* on the N. Teſt. p. 276. Aſſemblies Annot. on the Old and New Teſt. Vol. 2. and Notes on 39, 40, &c. ver. of the fifth Chap. of *John.*

(*b*) *J. le Clerc*, ſur le N. Teſt. p. 281. *Moiſe auquèl vous eſperez*; par la Doctrine duquel vous eſperez d'obtenir la vie eternelle.

(*c*) *Eraſmi* Paraph. in No. Teſt. p. 539. M. Bucerus in 4 Evang. 257. J. Toletus in Evang. Johannis Comm. Cologne, 1611. p. 503. *Scrutami Scripturas*, &c. Vos, inquit, ſcrutamini & inquiritis Scripturas, quia putatis in Obſervantiâ earum vitam poſitam æternam, & illæ ſunt quæ Teſtimonium perhibent de me, & tamen non vultis venire ad me, ut hanc vitam habeatis. Malitiam eorum arguit ſignificans eos proprio Scripturarum Studio convictos eſſe de veritate Chriſti, præ Malitiâ tamen nolle eum recipere, nec in ipſum credere, quamvis per Chriſtum vita hæc æterna conſequenda eſſet.

to

to the Governor *Felix*, he makes this Confeſſion, *After the Way which they*, (the *Jews*) *call Hereſy, ſo worſhip I the God of my Fathers, believing all Things which are written in the Law and the Prophets, and have Hope towards God which they themſelves alſo allow, that there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the Dead, both of the Juſt and Unjuſt?* (Acts xxiv. 14, 15.) Then St. *Paul* was induced from his Belief of what was written in the Law of *Moſes* and the Prophets to have Hope, which Hope from the ſame Belief the *Jews* alſo had, and *allowed they had*, that there was to be a Reſurrection of the Dead both of the Juſt and Unjuſt. And therefore both St. *Paul* and the *Jews* muſt have thought that there was in *Moſes* ſufficient Evidence to determine them to believe, that there was to be a future State of Rewards and Puniſhments. Some Part of this Evidence St. *Paul* himſelf hath explained to us. (*Heb.* ix. 7, 8, *&c.*) *But into the ſecond* (Tabernacle) *went the High Prieſt alone once every Year not without Blood, the Holy Ghoſt this ſignifying, that the Way into the holieſt of all was not yet made manifeſt while as the firſt Tabernacle was yet ſtanding; which was a Figure for the Time then preſent.* Then it was ſignified to the *Jews* who had that Tabernacle, and by *Moſes* who conſtituted it, that there was to be a Way made manifeſt into the holieſt of all. The Apoſtle is here talking of the *Jewiſh* Times, and of the Ceremonies appointed by *Moſes*, and ſays that he made thoſe Ceremonies Figures to them of ſomething farther: That the High Prieſt going into the Holy of Holies was a Figure to them, and therefore of courſe underſtood by them, that there was to be *another High Prieſt who ſhould carry other Blood*, (Ver. 24.) *Not into the holy Places made with Hands, the Figures of the true* holy Places, *but into Heaven itſelf.* This Chapter, and indeed this whole Epiſtle deſerves to be ſeriouſly conſidered by every Infidel

Infidel Sadducee: For if *Moſes* hath by expreſſive Actions or Figures deſcribed the *Jews* Hope in a future State, and in Chriſt who is Life eternal, and if St. *Paul* aſſerts that he hath, and that the *Jews* knew he had, and if we ſtill find thoſe very Figures in the Law, can any Thing be more plain than that a future State ought to have made a great Part of the Writings of *Moſes?* For why doth the Apoſtle aſſert, that the *Law was ſpiritual*, was intended to keep up the *Jews* Faith and Hopes in Chriſt? Why doth he recapitulate the chief Part of the religious Ceremonies of the *Jews*, and apply them to Chriſt and his Actions? Call them Figures for the Time then preſent. Figures of the true Things — The Example and Shadow of heavenly Things — The Shadow of the good Things to come — and from hence prove, that a true Notion of the Law muſt of courſe lead Men to the Goſpel, if either thoſe Ceremonies had not that Meaning, or if the *Jews* did not allow that they had?

But thoſe happy Effects which flowed from not taking the Ceremonies of the Law in a literal Senſe, and the conſequent Hopes of future Happineſs, are ſo fully deſcribed in the 11th Chapter of the *Hebrews*, that every Chriſtian muſt believe the Patriarchs and *Jews* did not reſt upon the temporal Promiſes, but were as well acquainted with a future State as we are at preſent. The Connexion between the Knowledge of Chriſt and a future State is ſo inſeparable, that we need not loſe Time to prove it: And that the *Faith* here ſo much inſiſted on is Faith in Chriſt, the Definition in the firſt Verſe fully proves; becauſe no other can teach us the Subſtance of what we are to hope for, or give us Evidence of the Things we have not ſeen; and becauſe this Faith was able to effect the Salvation of the Soul, which none but the Chriſtian Faith can do. (*Heb.* x. 38, 39. and *Acts* iv. 12.) And certainly when *Moſes eſteemed the Reproach of Chriſt greater*

greater Riches than the Treaſures of Egypt, (Ver. 26.) this could be nothing but Faith in Chriſt, by whoſe Merits he had learnt *to have reſpect to the Recompence of Reward:* And ſo all the other Inſtances Faith in the Mercies of God, which only are to be obtain'd thro' Faith in Chriſt. Let St. *Peter* convince us what this Faith is. *Now therefore* (ſays he to the Apoſtles and Elders, who were met to conſider, whether it was neceſſary for Chriſtians to obſerve the Law), *Why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Diſciples, which neither our Fathers, nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt we ſhall be ſaved, even as they*, (Acts xv. 10, 11.) Then the Fathers were ſaved by a Belief in Jeſus Chriſt, and therefore had not only Faith in him, but knew that Salvation alſo which he was to purchaſe for them. And if it be Faith in Chriſt, every Inſtance expreſſes their Belief of a future State (*a*). Thus *Abraham* certainly believed a

(*a*) *Hammond* on the 11th Chap. of *Heb.* p. 754, &c. Theophylact. in Epiſt. 991, to 1008. *Whitby* on the New Teſt. Vol. 2. from p. 536, to 544. *J. Lindſay* on the New Teſt. 778, to 783. Critici Sacri. Vol. 7. p. 4325. Druſij Not. Biſhop *Wilkins*, Serm. 8vo. p. 16. *Now Faith is the Subſtance of Things hoped for, the Evidence of Things not ſeen.* "Where "among the Things hoped for and not ſeen, are *clearly meant* "the Happineſs and Salvation we expect hereafter, the Re- "wards of a better Life, which Faith doth as really diſcern in "the Promiſes, as if they were actually preſent to the Senſe. "Hence it is that Salvation is ſaid to be the End of Faith, "*receiving the End of your Faith, even the Salvation of your* "*Souls*, 1 *Pet.* i. 9. So then if all religious Actions be deriv- "ed from Faith, as the main Root and Principle of them, and "if Faith doth chiefly refer to the Rewards hoped for and "not ſeen, then it muſt follow that it is as neceſſary for a Be- "liever to have a principal Aim at the Rewards, as it is for "him to live by Faith; and that he may as well pretend to "be above the Life of Faith, as to be above the Help of "thoſe Encouragements of the Rewards and Promiſes pro- "poſed in Scripture; and ſo far as Faith hath an Influence "upon our religious Actions, ſo far muſt we reſpect the Re- "compence of Reward. See the whole Diſcourſe."

future State, when he accounted that God was able to raiſe him up *Iſaac* even from the Dead. "Thus the Women who received their Dead raiſed to Life again; " and they who did not deſire Deliverance from their Tortures here, hoping they *might obtain a better Reſurrection* hereafter, " *they who confeſſed they were Strangers on the Earth and ſought after a heavenly Country*; " *they of whom this World was not worthy*; " and they, who notwithſtanding all their preſent Sufferings for the ſake of Religion, believed that God *was a Rewarder of them who diligently ſeek him*; and ſuch St. *Paul* ſays they all believed him to be, all theſe muſt have had a perfect Knowledge and ſtrong Hopes of an happy Immortality. For as he obſerves *theſe all died in Faith*, ſo had Faith in their Death, and therefore did not confine their Views to this Life: Becauſe he juſtly adds, though they had not received the Promiſes, *i. e.* had not ſeen the Completion of them, yet they ſaw them afar off, and were perſuaded of them: *Acts* xiii. 32, 33. fully prove, that it was the Demonſtration of a Reſurrection given us in the actual raiſing of Chriſt's Body which they had not received *(a)*. Not that they had not been told of, or had not received Promiſes, that their own Bodies were to be raiſed. *The*

(a) Grotij Op. Theol. Vol. 3. p. 658. Poli Synopſis Cr. Vol. 4. p. 1607. *Hammond* on the New Teſt. p. 429. *Acts* xxvi. 6. And accordingly now I am accuſed for aſſerting the Reſurrection of the Dead, which as it is a Doctrine acknowledged by the *Phariſees*, ſo is it the *fundamental Promiſe made of old*. *Whitby* on the New Teſt. Vol. 1. p. 708, 709. *Titus* i. 2. *In Hope of eternal Life which God that cannot lie promiſed, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων before the World began*. See the true Meaning of αἰων, and the Abſurdity of the Tranſlation, from *Acts* iii. 21. 2 *Tim.* i. 9. and *Rom.* xvi. 25. Critici Sacri. Vol. 7. p. 2432. Clarij Notæ, *Act.* xxvi. 6. *Et nunc de Spe Promiſſionis*, &c. Prædicare Chriſtum nihil erat aliud, quam annunciare Spem quæ ad Patres facta erat eſſe impletam, cujus Summa eſt Reſurrectio mortuorum, cui Inimici Judæi, dum ei reſiſtunt, manifeſtò adverſantur, *Acts* xxiii. 6. 2 *Tim.* i. 1.

Promiſe

Promiſe (ſays St. *Paul*) *which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the ſame unto us their Children, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again.* In *Acts* xxvi. 6, 7, and 8th ver. and in many other Places the ſame Expreſſion occurs. Then it appears that God had promiſed the Fathers he would raiſe up Jeſus from the Dead, though the Fathers did not live to ſee and receive the actual Completion of that Promiſe, but yet, as above cited, *ſaw it from afar, were perſuaded of it,* and, fully believing it would be performed in due Time, *embraced it.* Thus in the Reſurrection of Jeſus was a Demonſtration given of Life and Immortality, the Promiſe made to the Fathers fulfilled, and in this Senſe *Life and Immortality was brought to light by the Goſpel.* Though in any other Senſe it could not have been firſt diſcovered by the perſonal preaching of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; becauſe if the Goſpel brought it to Light, then the *Jews* muſt have been acquainted with it: For unto them, as well as unto us, was the Goſpel preached. *Hebrews* iv. 2.

But if the *Author of the divine Legation* ſhould take up the Arms, with which the *Infidels* have all along aſſaulted *Moſes*, and it is certain he can have no other to defend his *unchriſtian Cauſe* but the often foiled Weapons of *Sadducees*, *Infidels*, and *Atheiſts*; and if he ſhould object in their Words, "That ſuppoſing a future State was typified under the Law, yet it had no better Effect than if it had not, becauſe it was ſo hidden and obſcure, that the *Jews* did not ſee it." But if St. *Paul* hath ſhewed us ſome of the Types that were intended to point out a future State, and if he hath ſaid that the *Jews* knew this, that they looked beyond the Types, and if it be no where ſaid that they did not ſee and believe a future State, then one may preſume that the Authority of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, who affirm that the *Jews* did ſee it, will convince

every Chriſtian that they actually did *(a)*. The Apoſtle of the *Gentiles* forbids us to doubt of this Point. *The Law*, ſays he, *was our Schoolmaſter unto Chriſt*; was to teach us firſt the Letters, the Types, of which the Service of the Law conſiſted, which is the firſt Buſineſs of a Schoolmaſter; and afterwards the Meaning of them, what they repreſented, and what Ideas they were deſigned to convey, of what Perſons, what Objects, what Actions. This is the next Buſineſs of a Schoolmaſter and indeed the chief. And therefore if the *Jewiſh* Service conſiſted of ſuch Types, the *Jews* muſt have ſeen the Meaning of them, not only becauſe they could not be Types to them unleſs underſtood, but alſo becauſe it was the Buſineſs of the Law to be their Schoolmaſter to teach them how to underſtand them. And conſequently if St. *Paul* hath ſaid that there were certain Types in the Law, which were deſigned to point out a future State, and that the Law was a Schoolmaſter to teach what they did point out, it follows that it could not but teach the *Jews* a future State: Unleſs St. *Paul* ſhould not have known the Deſign of the Law, or the Law itſelf ſhould prove a bad Schoolmaſter. But hear the ſame Apoſtle on this Subject. After he had told us (*Heb.* ix. 19, 20, *&c.*) *That almoſt all Things by the Law are purged with Blood, and that without ſheidding of Blood there is no Remiſſion*, he adds; *It was therefore neceſſary that the Patterns of Things in the Heavens* (*b*), ὑποδείγματα, the Things

(*a*) See Biſhop *Bull*'s Sermons, Vol. 2. 574. Where he ſtrongly proves throughout this whole Diſcourſe, that the *Jews* even before the Law underſtood and believed that they ſhould be rewarded after this Life. *Stilling fleet*'s Or. Sac. 174, 175, 176. Sect. 8. *Acts* iii. 21, 24, *&c.*

(*b*) ὑποδείκνυω, præmonſtro, demonſtro per Rationem & Exempla, Gryphij Lexicon. Gr. & Lat. Par. 1541. J. Tuſani Lex. Gr. Lat. Venet. 1555. ὑποδείκνυω præmonſtro, demonſtro, per Rationem & Exempla, ſubdemonſtro, doceo.

R. Con-

Things that demonſtrated, pointed out, *viz.* the Ceremonies of the Law *under which the heavenly Things were demonſtrated*: So ſpoke a Language very intelligible to every thinking *Jew* who had a Soul to be ſaved, and which could not be ſaved, but by knowing and believing that they were only the Types and Figures of the heavenly Things, which Types it was neceſſary *ſhould be purified with theſe* Things that were alſo ὑποδείγματα. It was neceſſary that the Law ſhould contain ſuch external Objects to deſcribe the Perſon, Actions, and Sufferings of Chriſt, and convey the Benefits of them, ſo purify. Chriſt was at a Diſtance: It was therefore neceſſary that the Wrath he had engaged to undergo, and all the Circumſtances of his Sufferings ſhould be on many Accounts pointed out and demonſtrated continually till he came. The external Action; the ὑπόδειγμα was neceſſary, becauſe the *Jews* had Bodies: And Faith or an Inſight into the ſpiritual Senſe was neceſſary, becauſe they had Souls, which only can be purified through Faith, Hope, and Charity *(a)*. And thus it was neceſſary there ſhould be material Objects to demonſtrate the heavenly Things, becauſe the Eye of the Soul ſees only through the Eye of the Body: *But the heavenly Things* themſelves (which theſe demonſtrated) *by better Sacrifices than theſe*, it was neceſſary to the Nature of the Soul, that there ſhould be Faith, that it ſhould be purified by the Originals themſelves, by looking at the real Blood of that Perſon, which the Blood of the Beaſts demonſtrated. All the Types and Ceremonies were Demonſtrations of

R. Conſtantini Lex. Gr. Lat. Lugd. 1637. ὑποδείκνυω præmonſtro, demonſtro per Rationem & Exempla, ſuggero, ſubmoneo. Hederici Lex. Gr. Lat. ὑποδείκνυμι ſubmonſtro, ſuboſtendo, præmonſtro, ſubmoneo. H. Curio Lex. Gr. Lat. Baſil. 1541. ὑποδείκνυω præmonſtro, demonſtro per Rationem & Exempla.

(a) *Rom.* ii. 28, 29. *Deut.* x. 16. viii. 3. *Rom.* iii. 30, 31. x. 5, 6, *&c.* 1 *Cor.* x. to ver. 13.

ſomething they pointed at; material Repreſentations of ſomething ſpiritual, which could communicate no Virtue but when carried up from the literal to a higher Meaning: Becauſe thoſe Things which the Law demonſtrated, as Remiſſion by Blood, *&c.* were to be rightly apprehended before effectual. The Beaſt till Chriſt came was to be ſlain, his Blood to be poured out, ſome Parts to be burnt, *&c.* But then the Benefit the Sacrificer was taught to expect was from a better Sacrifice than this: He was, if St. *Paul* may be believed, to look upon it in no other View, than as it demonſtrated the great Sacrifice of Chriſt, who was in Effect *the Lamb ſlain from the Foundation of the World.* And therefore if the Law did really explain its Types and Ceremonies, and if St. *Paul* ſays it was neceſſary it ſhould do this, ſhould contain *Demonſtrations* of heavenly Things, was it not alſo neceſſary the *Jews* ſhould know *(a)* it? Elſe how could it demonſtrate, what was not ſeen, or why was it a Pattern, unleſs they could obſerve ſome Compariſon?

But if it ſhould be ſaid, as it often hath been, that if the *Jews* were always capable of this ſpiritual Senſe, what Occaſion for a carnal one? The Reaſon of inſtituting the Types hath been hinted at above, and will be more fully conſidered under my ſecond Propoſition. But let it ſuffice to obſerve at preſent, that though the *Egyptian* Religion was hieroglyphical, yet it was not therefore unintelligible: Did not the *Greeks* travel thither for Knowledge, and ſet up for Philoſophers with the ſmall Stock they had got from the *Egyptian* Prieſts? And if all our Knowledge come in originally by our Senſes, is it not abſolutely neceſſary, that we ſhould have ſome outward and viſible Signs of what is abſent and inviſible? Are not the Chriſtian Sacra-

(a) Stillingfleet's Orig. Sacr. p. 223, 224. Sect. 12.

ments

ments ſuch, and are they not more uſeful, the more plain and expreſſive they are? And if they had not been intelligible and adapted to the meaneſt Capacities, with what Juſtice could God have ſo often reproved the *Jews* by his Prophets for reſting on the Letter of the Law; or where would be the Crime of the *apoſtate Author of the plain Account* to degrade and ſink one of the Chriſtian Sacraments into a common Meal? The *Jewiſh* as well as the Chriſtian Religion was intended to make Men wiſe unto Salvation, and therefore whether or no they knew that Salvation, yet certainly the Means ought to have been plain and obvious, otherwiſe it could not have been criminal to have had a wrong Notion of the Means, when they were ignorant of the End. There was this Occaſion then for the carnal Senſe that the ſpiritual could not have ſubſiſted without it, and that we muſt have ſuch Helps, whilſt we go through this State of Trial to the Regions of Viſion and Happineſs.

I have mentioned but a ſmall Part of the Evidence which the New Teſtament affords to prove, that a future State ought to have made Part of the Law by *Moſes*. However enough hath been ſaid to convince every Chriſtian that ſuch a Doctrine actually is there, becauſe Chriſt and his Apoſtles have aſſerted, that it is — have produced Texts from *Moſes* to prove the Certainty of it — have ſaid that he wrote about Chriſt's Reſurrection, and ours — that the Ceremonies inſtituted by him were intended to deſcribe the *Jews* Hope in a future State — that the whole Law was ſpiritual — was a Shadow of the good Things to come — of the true Things — an Example and Shadow of heavenly Things — and a Figure to the Time then preſent. So it was in *Moſes*'s Writings whether the *Jews* ſaw it or no; but Numbers are mentioned who did ſee it, who ſaw the Promiſes afar off; were perſuaded of them, and in Conſequence thereof expected an happy Reſurrection. But

But we need not reſt the Point here. If it hath appeared from plain Arguments drawn from the Reaſon of the Thing, and from poſitive Texts of Scripture, that the Doctrine of a future State ought to be found in the Law, may we not fairly conclude that it is there, *that it is actually to be found in, and doth make a very great Part of the Writings of* Moſes. One might eaſily ſhew the Force of this Concluſion, if we had no better Proofs: But when we ſhall have proved our ſecond Propoſition *that the Doctrine of a future State actually is to be found in, and doth make a very great Part of the Writings of* Moſes; *the Obligation to obſerve every Law, Rite, and Ceremony being enforced upon the Sanctions of future Rewards and Puniſhments*, this will more fully clear up the Point. The Time will not permit me to prove and enlarge upon it at preſent. I will only treſpaſs upon your Patience whilſt I mention one Thing, which comes particularly recommended to the ſerious Attention of every one in this Place, *viz.* That the Articles and Homilies of the Church of *England* expreſly aſſert, that *Moſes* hath treated of a future State. The 7th Article begins thus.

The Old Teſtament is not contrary to the New: For both in the Old and New Teſtament everlaſting Life is offered to Mankind by Chriſt, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore *they are not to be heard*, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for tranſitory Promiſes.

The Words of the ſecond Part of the Homily on Faith are theſe. This is the Chriſtian Faith, which theſe holy Men (of whom St. *Paul* ſpeaks in the eleventh Chapter of the *Hebrews*) had, and we alſo ought to have. And although they were not named Chriſtian Men, yet was it a Chriſtian Faith that they had, for they looked for all Benefits of God the Father, through the Merits

rits of his Son Jeſu Chriſt, as we do now (*a*). And in Effect they and we be all one. We have the ſame Faith that they had in God, and they the ſame that we have. And St. *Paul* ſo much extolleth their Faith, becauſe we ſhould not leſs, but rather more give ourſelves wholly unto Chriſt, both in Profeſſion and Living, now when Chriſt is come, as the old Fathers did before his coming. And by all the Declaration of St. *Paul* it is evident, that the true, lively and Chriſtian Faith is no dead, vain, or unfruitful Thing, but a Thing of perfect Virtue, of wonderful Operation, or Working and Strength, bringing forth all good Motions and good Works.

If then the Articles and Homilies of the Church of *England* aſſert, that the Fathers of the *Jewiſh* Nation expected a future State of eternal Happineſs through the Merits of Chriſt, we, who have ſubſcribed to thoſe Articles and Homilies, muſt believe this Doctrine. And if Men may diſbelieve the Articles and Homilies, and yet ſubſcribe to them — and after that Subſcription write directly againſt thoſe very Doctrines to which they have ſubſcribed—and if they ſhould be encouraged and countenanced by Numbers, who alſo have ſubſcribed to them — and if that very Church, which requires this Subſcription, ſhould not cenſure ſuch

(*a*) 1 *John* v. 11. *God hath given us eternal Life, and that Life is in his Son*; therefore if they knew the Son (Chriſt) they muſt know eternal Life. Life and Immortality were loſt and forfeited in *Adam*, and reſtored to us again by Jeſus Chriſt, and how then could there be Faith in Chriſt, unleſs there was an Aſſurance that he would give them the eternal Life forfeited? Can that be Faith in Chriſt, which hath no Regard to what he was to do and ſuffer for us, or to what End he was to ſuffer? But if it was the ſame Faith as we have, then the Homily means, that they expected all the ſame Advantages as we do here and hereafter from our common Redeemer, and our common Faith in him, *Heb.* vi. 1, 2. *Acts* iv. 2. *Rom.* vi. 23.

a mani-

a manifeſt Breach of her Laws, which ſhe maintains are founded upon the Laws of God; this would be a moſt melancholy State of Religion, and from ſuch Perſons and ſuch Proceedings will all Chriſtians pray,

Good Lord deliver us.

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM 9 JY 74